

Response
Application No. 09/890,273
Attorney Docket No. 042203

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 7, 8 and 14 have been amended. Applicant believes this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated June 25, 2007

Claim Objections

Claims 7-8 and 14 are objected to due to minor informalities. It is submitted that each of claims 7, 8 and 14 have been amended to correct such informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Jacobs et al.* (US Patent 6,006,285). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

...a controller receiving a signal representing the active state of said CPU and a signal representing the operating state of said switch for carrying out supply control of driving power to said reproducer and said output circuit and output control of a command to said reproducer on the basis of the two signals.

The Examiner argues that the above-listed feature of claim 1 is disclosed in *Jacobs*. The Examiner relies on the argument that, according to the passages cited in the Office Action, the

system in *Jacobs* is capable of supplying power to the CD-ROM drive in either mode of operation. The two operating modes in *Jacobs* are the PC mode and audio CD mode. In PC mode, the computer functions as a computer and controls the CD-ROM. In audio CD mode, the computer does not need to be booted up in order for the CD-ROM to play a CD.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the reference, *Jacobs*. The Examiner cites col. 1, lines 30-64, col. 5, lines 17-21 and col. 6, line 4 through col. 9, line 12. However, the Examiner does not specifically point out which limitation in the reference acts similarly to the controller of claim 1. Even if the Examiner meant to point out the keyboard controller or CD-ROM drive controller of the reference (column 6, line 27-31), neither limitation discloses the controller of claim 1.

The controller of claim 1 receives two signals, one representing the active state of the CPU and one representing the operating state of the switch. Neither the keyboard controller nor the CD-ROM drive controller receives any signal regarding the state of the computer. In fact, the state of the computer is determined by the output of the keyboard controller (which receives the signal from the audio CD mode switch 56). The reference discloses a keyboard controller that can effectively override the on/off state of the computer (acting as a computer). Therefore, the "controller receiving a signal representing the active state of said CPU and a signal representing the operating state of said switch for carrying out supply control of driving power" of claim 1 is not disclosed or fairly suggested in *Jacobs*.

Independent Claim 2

As noted above, *Jacobs* fails to disclose the “controller receiving a signal representing the active state of said CPU and a signal representing the operating state of said switch for carrying out supply control of driving power” of claim 1. Claim 2 also includes the “controller” feature of claim 1. Therefore, all the elements of claim 2 are not disclosed in *Jacobs*.

Claim 2 also includes the added features of a power supply circuit and new criteria for supplying driving power to the reproducer and output circuit. The feature of the claim is recited as, “a power supply circuit receiving said power supply control signal and the signal representing the active state of said CPU for supplying said reproducer and said output circuit with driving power when *at least one of both the signals is active.*”

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of the reference, *Jacobs* with respect to claim 2. The reproducer of the application is supplied power if the CPU signal or the switch signal is high (active). In *Jacobs*, the computer must be told whether or not to function as a computer by the audio CD mode switch.

In contrast, claim 2 accounts for the active and inactive states of the CPU and operates the reproducer accordingly. The signals of claim 2 received by the power supply determine whether power is supplied to the *reproducer* and the *output circuit*, the signals do not control the on/off state of the CPU (see Figure 1, CD power ON and Main ON signals supplied to OR gate 9,

output of the gate received by power supply circuit 8 which controls CD Power and AMP Power, but not the CPU 1 power).

Therefore, it is submitted that *Jacobs* also fails to disclose or fairly suggest the additional features of claim 2 regarding the “controller receiving a signal representing the active state of said CPU and a signal representing the operating state of said switch for carrying out supply control of driving power.”

Independent Claim 3

As noted above, *Jacobs* fails to disclose the “controller receiving a signal representing the active state of said CUP and a signal representing the operating state of said switch for carrying out supply control of driving power” of claim 1. Claim 3 also includes the “controller” feature of claim 1. Therefore, all the elements of claim 3 are not disclosed in *Jacobs*.

Claim 3 differs from claims 1 and 2 in that it adds a third signal to be considered when determining whether power is supplied to the reproducer. The third signal represents the output state of the reproducer.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of the reference, *Jacobs*. In *Jacobs*, the mode of the computer is determined by *one* signal, the audio mode CD switch.

Response
Application No. 09/890,273
Attorney Docket No. 042203

However, claim 3 calls for *three* signals to be used to control the driving power sent to the reproducer and output circuit.

Independent Claim 4

As noted above, *Jacobs* fails to disclose the “controller receiving a signal representing the active state of said CUP and a signal representing the operating state of said switch for carrying out supply control of driving power” of claim 1. Claim 4 also includes the “controller” feature of claim 1. Therefore, all the elements of claim 4 are not disclosed in *Jacobs*.

Claim 4 contains all the features of claim 1 and the additional features of a power supply and *three* signals used to determine driving power (claim 1 with the additional features of claims 2 and 3).

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of the reference, *Jacobs* and raise all the arguments presented above for claims 1, 2 and 3.

Independent Claim 9

Claim 9 recites the additional feature of “a monitoring circuit for monitoring the reproduction output state of said reproducer.” The monitoring circuit utilizes a comparison circuit for judging if there is a signal present on the right and left channels of the reproducer output signal.

The Examiner argues that the additional feature of the monitoring circuit appears in the reference in column 6, lines 4-26. Specifically, the Examiner points to the limitation disclosed in the reference of the previous and next track buttons of the CD buttons.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the reference, *Jacobs* and use the arguments stated above for claims 1-4 and the further arguments presented here. The Examiner claims that the passage cited discloses the monitoring of the previous and next track buttons. In the passage cited by the Examiner (column 6, lines 4-26), no mention is made of any monitoring of the CD buttons. Elsewhere in the reference there is mention of the CD buttons being "checked" by the keyboard controller 46 when the system is in audio CD mode (column 6, lines 27-46).

However, even if the previous and next buttons were monitored as the Examiner argues, that would not indicate whether the CD-ROM was actively outputting a signal. For example, the previous and next buttons would not be used at all for some time if someone is listening to an entire CD or if the CD is paused or stopped. In addition, even if all the CD buttons were monitored by the keyboard controller 46 in the reference, the keyboard controller would still not be able to tell if there was a signal present on both the left and right channels of the reproducer (see Figure 2, Timer Circuit 20). Claim 9 clearly calls for "monitoring the reproduction *output state of said reproducer*," and not the state of the CD buttons. Therefore, the monitoring feature of claim 9 is not disclosed in *Jacobs*.

Response
Application No. 09/890,273
Attorney Docket No. 042203

Additionally, Applicant relies on the arguments presented above for the other claims of this application.

In light of the above, Applicant submits that the reference does not disclose all the elements of claim 9. Therefore, claim 9 is not anticipated by *Jacobs*.

Independent Claims 10-12

Independent claims 10-12 also include the monitoring feature that is recited in claim 9. As such, Applicant relies on the arguments presented above regarding claim 9 to traverse the Examiner's rejection as to claims 10-12.

In light of the above, it is submitted that the reference does not disclose all the elements of claims 10-12. Therefore, claims 10-12 are not anticipated by *Jacobs*.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Response

Application No. 09/890,273

Attorney Docket No. 042203

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Thomas E. Brown
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,450
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/nrp/klf